

REMARKS:

This application has been carefully studied and amended in view of the Office Action dated May 12, 2008. Reconsideration of that action is requested in view of the following.

Figures 1 and 2 have been amended to indicate by reference numerals the sets of side edges. Page 11 has been amended to refer to the matter questioned by Examiner Guidotti. It is submitted that the amplification made to page 11 does not involve new matter, but rather is merely a restatement of what is stated elsewhere in the specification and what is clearly illustrated, particularly in Figures 1 and 2.

The allowability of Claims 12 and 40 and the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 39 and 43 is noted with appreciation. Claim 39 has now been placed in independent form by incorporating its subject matter in former parent Claim 1. Similarly, Claim 43 has been placed in independent form by incorporating its subject matter in its former parent Claim 14.

In placing Claims 39 and 43 in independent form the rejection of those claims under 35 USC §112 has been taken into account. In that regard, the question portion of those claims now refers to "central section" which has antecedent basis in the prior part of the claim, rather than referring to "bottom section".

Claims 37 and 42 have also been amended in view of the

rejection of those claims as being indefinite. As now amended each claim makes clear that the first end is both free of flaps and it is also the first end which is free of an open area.


It is noted that allowed Claim 12 has been amended in the fourth line from the end of that claim to replace "section" with "of said loop". It is believed that this amendment is desirable for consistency with the prior portion of the claim which refers to "said bottom of said loop", whereas there had been no antecedent basis for "said bottom section". If Examiner Guidotti finds such amendment to be objectionable and prefers other language it is requested that she telephone the undersigned attorney.

There are now 3 independent claims, namely Claims 1, 12 and 14. Claim 12 has already been allowed. Claims 1 and 14 should now be allowed because they incorporate the subject matter of their previously dependent claims 39 and 43 which were indicated as allowable. The remaining claims are all claims which are dependent on the above noted allowed/allowable claims. Accordingly, the remaining dependent claims should also be allowed, at the very least for their dependency on the allowed/allowable parent claims. This includes Claims 9-10 and 18-20 which were withdrawn from consideration.

If Examiner Guidotti has any suggestions for placing this application in its best form for allowance it is respectfully

requested that she telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully Submitted,

By: 
Harold Pezzner Esquire
Reg. No. 22,112
Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz, LLP
1007 N. Orange Street
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 658-9141

@PFDesktop\::ODMA/MHODMA/IMANDMS;CB;620079;1